

REMARKS

The election of claims 4 and 5 is affirmed, as requested.

The abstract is reduced to less than 150 words, as requested.

Fig. 1 is corrected from ℓ to P, as requested.

However, the rejection of claim 4 under 35 USC 103 for obviousness from the cited Byron and Thompson patents is traversed, as is such rejection if it were to be applied to new claim 6, which corresponds to claim 4 with the functional description of the specification deleted. Claims 4 and 6 require stent bodies of wires that interlock and intersect. Figs. 1, 4, 6, 15 and 18 of the Byron patent shows, instead, single-piece, e.g., expanded metal stent bodies, as admitted in the Action.

Therefore the Action cites the Thompson patent, but no motivation to do this is evident, except hindsight to reconstruct the claimed invention, which is not permitted, of course.

Even if the combination of patents were proper, it still does not make the invention of claims 4 and 6 obvious, because the Thompson patent only discloses in Figs. 2a, 5 and 6, for example, various two- and three-dimensional braids that are different from the P/2P interlocking and intersecting structure claimed that provides the combination of bending and longitudinal expanding and contracting functions described in the specification (and somewhat in claim 4) for the different, wire stent bodies claimed.


Adding the Lentz patent to a corresponding rejection of claim 5 and new, more broadly corresponding claim 7 also fails from lack of motivation and the cuff structures that are not the claimed stitching and impregnating.

More particularly, the claimed invention has a triple-layered stent structure to be effectively bent correspondingly to a contracted muscular passage, etc. This is achieved by fabrication into a net-like structure 50 by knitting first and second shape memory alloy wires 10 and 11 as claimed in claim 4, and not the dual stent structure (Bynon), zigzag structure (Thompson), immersing both ends of stent in a polyurethane solution (Bynon and Thomson), and flaps 30 and 32 and cuffs 20 and 22 (Lentz).

Moreover, those patents don't disclose the invention claimed in Claim 4 and Claim 5, because they also require a hollow rubber tube closely fitted between the inner and outer stent bodies to contract and expand. The cited patent no. 5,667,523 to Bynon uses tubular biocompatible flexible layer sandwiched between two structural support layers, for example a first structural support, such as a stent, and a second structural support, such as a stent. And this stent just contracts or expands in a radial and longitudinal direction, However, as shown in Fig. 1, it can't be effectively bent to the shape corresponding to the desire bent part and maintain its bent shape. The cited patent no. 5,718,159 to Thompson uses multiple structure strands 32 and textile strands 42 wound as shown in Fig. 6, and Figs. 7-10, and radially contracts and expands stent, however, the stent doesn't bent to the shape corresponding to the desire bent part of a contracted muscular passage etc. The cited patent no. 5,522,881 to Lentz uses cuffs 20 and 22 encompassing the outer stent body. However, the claimed invention is stitched by thread on both ends of stent and form a sewn end, and then immersed in a polyurethane solution to form a resin-impregnated part.

Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, requested.

Respectfully submitted,



William R. Evans
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
26 West 61st Street
New York, New York 10023
Reg. No. 25858
Tel. No. (212) 708-1930

IN THE DRAWING

A Replacement Sheet is attached to change ℓ to P in Fig. 1, as requested.